

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 533

95

SO 011 224

AUTHOR Maust, Ann Parker; Knight, Lucy
TITLE An Analysis of the Role of the U.S. Office of Education and Other Selected Federal Agencies in Citizen Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO OE-78-07002
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 61p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Citizen Participation; *Citizenship; Community Programs; Curriculum Development; Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Government Role; Higher Education; Mass Media; *Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; State of the Art Reviews; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The document describes a sampling of Federal resources available for improving citizen education. It was prepared to give staff members of Federal agencies an overview of educational programs dealing with citizen education and to help educators as they design and implement citizen education programs. The document is presented in two Parts. Part I reviews and analyzes U.S. Office of Education (USOE) programs which directly support citizen education or which indirectly contribute to public participation in citizen education. Programs include Fulbright-Hays, Ethnic Heritage Studies, International Studies Centers, and Teacher Corps. Part II describes citizen education activities of the Education Division, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as some programs of the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. For each program, information is given on type and extent of Federal involvement, objectives and background, eligible applicants, geographic participation, address and contact person, and relationship of the program to citizen education. (DB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED160533

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND
OTHER SELECTED FEDERAL AGENCIES
IN CITIZEN EDUCATION

By

Ann Parker Maust
Citizen Education Office

and

Lucy Knight
Education Funding Research Council

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
AND WELFARE

Joseph A. Califano, Secretary

Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary
for Education

Office of Education

Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner

HEW Publication No. (OE) 78-01002

SP011224

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.--No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

FOREWORD

As part of its mandate to study the state of citizen education and participation in the United States, the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) staff has conducted a survey of programs with the Education Division, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and selected other Federal agencies. The survey was designed to help the staff prepare recommendations concerning an appropriate Federal role in this area, and to help program developers and planners better utilize existing Federal resources. Since citizen education is not a priority of any Federal agency, and since elements of citizen education are scattered throughout many different programs and agencies, we hope that this analysis can be used as a starting point for bringing together resources, engendering collaboration, and promoting more rational planning for citizen education.

The study is divided into two parts. The first contains a review and analysis of Office of Education programs which directly support citizen education or which indirectly contribute through the development of vehicles for public participation in education. Part II includes other activities of the Education Division, HEW, as well as some programs in the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, the National Endowment for Humanities, and the National Science Foundation.

We have tried to include relevant programs with potential for making a substantial contribution to citizen education. Since there are many pertinent agency programs outside the Education Division of HEW, an appendix to this report contains a list of resources which should help direct readers to sources of additional information.

Ann Maust conducted extensive research in order to prepare the analysis and descriptions of USOE programs. Lucy Knight contributed research for Part II, while Karen Dawson and Judy Taggart provided advice and editorial services. Federal program officers in the four agencies surveyed supplied

essential background information for the program descriptions.

Prepared by the U.S. Office of Education Citizen Education Staff, this study is one in a series designed to help raise issues and provide information about the current state of citizen education. Others in the series include:

Key Concepts of Citizenship: Perspectives
and Dilemmas

New Directions in Mass Communications Policy:
Implications for Citizen Education and
Participation

Citizen Education Today: Developing Civic
Competencies

Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency
for Public Policy

Citizen Education and the Future

Citizen Education in the Workplace

Elizabeth Farquhar, Coordinator
Citizen Education Office
U.S. Office of Education

CONTENTS

Foreword.....	111
Introduction.....	1
Definitions: components, skills, programs.....	1
Part I: USOE programs.....	2
USOE programs which directly provide resources for citizen education.....	11
USOE programs which indirectly contribute to citizen education.....	32
Part II: Other agencies.....	35
Program Descriptions: a sampler of other agencies.....	39
Notes.....	50
Appendix.....	53

INTRODUCTION

The signs are clear - many Americans lack the necessary knowledge, attitudes, skills, and experiences required for effective and responsible citizenship. One recent national survey documents sharp declines in student knowledge of democratic concepts and political functions and institutions.^{1/} Another nationwide study emphasizes that many adults lack a functional competency in government and law.^{2/}

This report describes a sampling of available Federal resources for improving citizen education. While the Office of Education is emphasized, other agencies are discussed. The focus is on action-oriented programs: for example, a series of discussion groups, training workshops, a new course or curriculum in a school or college. Research programs or those that focus on professional training have been excluded.

For those interested in learning more about funding sources, current information on grants may be obtained from the Federal Register or from publications which monitor the availability of Federal funds. Subscription information to these publications appears in the appendix which also lists several reference guides for applying for grants in general.

Some Federal and State agencies issue program guides or announcements annually before the fiscal year begins. For example, the National Endowment for the Humanities, which is discussed at the end of this study, does not insert grant notices in the Federal Register, but instead compiles a guide to programs of its education division.

DEFINITIONS: COMPONENTS, SKILLS, PROGRAMS

In undertaking this analysis, a framework was established which defines citizen education as encompassing three components which together should provide the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences necessary for effective and responsible citizenship. These areas include: Legal rights and responsibilities, and the values and principles underlying them; public

issues; and participation for personal development and political advocacy. Table 1 depicts some representative objectives under each category.

It should be noted that a number of basic skills serve as prerequisites for civic competency. While some of these may be learned in citizen education programs, many are learned outside such classes. These include basic communication skills -- reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

They also involve intellectual skills such as the ability of individuals to process information, think critically, generate alternatives, and solve problems. They include attitudes such as the disposition to work with others, and to take the perspective of those whose views differ from one's own. And, finally, a prerequisite of active citizenship is a strong self-concept and a sense of efficacy -- a feeling the individual can make a difference.

PART I: USOE PROGRAMS

In examining USOE programs which contribute to developing civic competency, two kinds were identified: those which directly provide resources for developing civic competency and those which may contribute indirectly through encouraging public participation. Table 2 distinguishes between these two groups within the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) programs. The following section analyzes both approaches within USOE, giving examples of existing programs.

In addition to the USOE programs that play a direct role in enhancing civic competency and increasing public participation, several other programs have the potential of playing such a role. Table 3 lists these two types of programs.

Table 1. - Some Representative Objectives

Major Areas of Citizen Education	Knowledge	Skills*	Attitudes*
1. Legal Rights and Responsibilities	System of law and government Principles and values underlying them Relationship to human needs and cultural change Governance	Analysis Conflict resolu- tion Ethical reasoning	Valuing democratic principles: Freedom, equality, justice, human dignity, majority rule, and minority rights
2. Public Issues	Political/economic/ social systems and how they interrelate Issues of local, State, national, and international concern Global interdependence Public policymaking process Growth of public sector	Data-gathering (or generating) Information-process- ing and inter- preting Problem-definition and solution Evaluating future consequences of policy alternatives	See 1 and 3.
3. Participation for personal development and to achieve speci- fic objectives	Group processes Political and interest groups Structure and function of public institutions and their points of access Modes of participation and how they evolve	Listening, speaking Negotiating with authorities Perspective-taking Working with a group	Self-esteem, Efficacy Personal identification and belonging Responsibility and concern for the group as a whole

*Some attributes listed here are not the sole responsibility of either citizen education classes or even the schools. They are learned in a variety of settings, but, like basic communications skills, are vital to effective citizen education.

Table 2. - USOE Program Role in Citizen Education

PROGRAM	DIRECT	INDIRECT
National Diffusion Network	x	
Ellender Fellowships	x	
Title IV-C (ESEA)	x	x
Adult Education	x	
Community Services/ Continuing Education	x	
Environmental Education	x	
Consumer Education	x	
International Studies Centers Program	x	
Undergraduate and Graduate International Studies	x	
Fulbright-Hays Programs	x	
Ethnic Heritage Studies	x	x
Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act		x
Bilingual Education		x
Follow Through		x
Emergency School Aid Act		x
Community Education		x
Teacher Corps		x
Indian Education Act, Part A		x
Education of Handicapped Act, Part B		x

Table 3. - Programs With a Direct Role in Citizenship Education

ACTUAL	POTENTIAL
National Diffusion Network	Educational Television Programming
Ellender Fellowships	Teacher Centers
Title IV-C	Grant Program to Promote Cultural Understanding
Adult Education	
Community Services/Continuing Education	
Environmental Education	
Consumer Education	
International Studies Centers Program	
Undergraduate and Graduate International Studies Program	
Fulbright-Hays	
Ethnic Heritage Studies	

Of the programs listed as having an actual direct role, only the National Diffusion Network (NDN) provides a mechanism through which exemplary citizen education program activities can be disseminated and expanded on a national basis. NDN is already helping interested school districts adopt one program model -- the Institute for Political and Legal Education (New Jersey). To date, this model has been adapted by approximately 400 schools in 40 States.^{3/}

The other programs listed in Table 3 fund educational activities that are designed to enhance individual knowledge and skills needed for civic competency.

Of these programs, two are directed specifically toward youth, four toward adults, and four serve both youth and adults. Table 4 provides a breakdown of these programs by target population. Table 5 indicates whether education for civic competency is the sole mission of the program or only part of its mission.

Table 4. - Programs Directly Involved in Education for Civic Competency

YOUTH PROGRAMS*	ADULT PROGRAMS**
Ellender Fellowships Title IV-C	Adult Education Community Service/ Continuing Education Undergraduate and Graduate International Studies Program Fulbright-Hays Programs
	Consumer Education Environmental Education International Studies Centers Program Ethnic Heritage Studies

*Youth includes elementary and secondary school programs

**Adult includes postsecondary programs, as well as community and traditional adult education programs for individuals over the age of 16.

As Table 5 indicates, only one USOE program -- the Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program -- has as its total mission educating youth for civic competency. Table 6 shows the geographic distribution of Ellender Fellowships for the 1977-1978 school year.

Another program, Title IV-C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has been used as a source of support for improving citizen competency programs in elementary and secondary schools. Currently, 27 States are funding citizen education-related projects with Title IV-C monies. Table 7 provides a breakdown of these States by region.

No program within the U.S. Office of Education is specifically designed to develop civic knowledge and skills among the adult population. Two programs -- Adult Education and Community Service and Continuing Education -- include some civic competency projects. Also, two programs within the International Education Division of USOE -- the Undergraduate and Graduate International Studies Program and the Fulbright-Hays Program -- by providing opportunities for adults to learn about various world regions, help foster civic competency among Americans.

Four USOE programs -- Environmental Education, Consumer Education, Ethnic Heritage Studies, and the International Studies Centers Program -- fund educational activities designed to promote civic competency among both adults and youth.

While these programs have already been used to develop civic competencies among youth and adults, three other programs have unutilized potential for contributing to citizen education.

The Educational Television Programming Division of the U.S. Office of Education could help fund the development and operation of citizen education programs through either television or radio. The new Teacher Centers Program could be used to develop citizen education curriculum and train teachers in the use of new methods and materials. And finally, the Grant Program to Promote Cultural Understanding, which has never been funded, could help develop educational programs which would promote U.S. understanding of

Table 5. - Programs with a Direct Role in Education
for Civic Competency

OE Program	Sole Mission	Partial Mission
<u>Youth</u>		
Ellender Fel- lowships	x	
Title IV-C		x
<u>Adults</u>		
Adult Education		x
Community Ser- vices/ Con- tinuing Education		x
Undergraduate and Graduate Inter- national Stu- dies Program		x
Fulbright-Hays Programs		x
<u>Youth and Adult</u>		
Consumer Education		x
Environmental Edu- cation		x
International Studies Centers Program		x
Ethnic Heritage Studies		x

Table 6. - Geographic Distribution of Ellender
Fellowships 1977-1978

REGION	STATES WITH FELLOWSHIPS	STATES WITH- OUT FELLOWSHIPS
WEST	Arizona	Alaska
	California	Idaho
	Colorado	Hawaii
	Wyoming	Montana
	Washington	Oregon
		Utah
		New Mexico
		Nevada
SOUTH/ SOUTH- WEST	Florida	Alabama
	Georgia	Arkansas
	Texas	Mississippi
	Tennessee	Kentucky
	Louisiana	South Carolina
	North Carolina	Virginia
CENTRAL/ MIDWEST	Ohio	Nebraska
	Iowa	Kansas
	Illinois	North Dakota
	Missouri	South Dakota
	Michigan	Wisconsin
	Minnesota	Indiana
	Oklahoma	
NORTH/ MID ATLANTIC	Massachusetts	Delaware
	New York	Maine
	Pennsylvania	Connecticut
	Rhode Island	New Hampshire
	Washington, D.C.*	Vermont
	West Virginia	Maryland
		New Jersey

*Students from both Maryland and Virginia are included in this Close-up Program.

Source: "Close-up: Compilation of Materials, 1977-78"
Washington, D.C.:

Close-Up Foundation, 1978, p. 3.

Table 7. - The Use of Title IV-C (ESEA) Funds for
Citizen Education Projects, by State***

REGION	STATES THAT ARE FUNDING CITIZEN EDUCATION PROJECTS	STATES THAT ARE NOT FUNDING CITIZEN EDU- CATION PROJECTS
WEST	Arizona	Idaho
	California*	Montana
	Colorado**	Nevada
	Oregon	Washington
	Utah	Wyoming
		New Mexico
SOUTH SOUTH- WEST	Arkansas	Alabama
	Florida**	Kentucky
	Georgia	Mississippi
	Louisiana	South Carolina
	North Carolina	Tennessee
	Texas*	
	Virginia*	
MIDWEST/ CENTRAL	Illinois*	Indiana
	Iowa	Kansas
	Missouri	Michigan
	Nebraska	Minnesota
	Ohio	Wisconsin
	Oklahoma**	South Dakota
	North Dakota	
NORTH/ MID- ATLANTIC	Maine	Connecticut
	Maryland*	Delaware
	New Hampshire	District of Columbia
	New Jersey	Massachusetts
	New York**	West Virginia
	Pennsylvania	
	Rhode Island*	
	Vermont**	

*Funds are used for law-related projects

**Funds are used for both citizenship education and
law-related projects

***Alaska and Hawaii not included in analysis

Source: Telephone interviews with State Title IV-C
Coordinators, July - August 1978.

other nations -- an understanding which could help students better evaluate the impact, both internationally and domestically, of major National policies.

USOE PROGRAMS WHICH DIRECTLY PROVIDE
RESOURCES FOR CITIZEN EDUCATION

PROGRAM NAME,	Educational Innovation and
ADDRESS, AND	Support, Division of State
LEGISLATIVE	Educational Assistance Programs
AUTHORITY:	U.S. Office of Education
	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Title IV, Part C, Elementary and
	Secondary Education Act

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Funds are distributed to 58 State and territorial education agencies which award grants to local education agencies.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The program of Innovation and Support provides consolidated grants that can be used by State and local education agencies to tailor programs to their own needs. Through this program, school districts are awarded grants to develop improved practices in a number of areas including basic skills; these may then be replicated by other interested school districts. Grants may be used for strengthening State departments of education, dropout prevention, supplementary education services, and nutrition and health. A few specific limitations on State spending are mandated by law, e.g., not more than 15 percent of the funds received or the amount available for such purpose in FY 78 may be used for strengthening State and local departments of education; of the remaining funds, not more than 5 percent may be spent on State administration and 15 percent must be spent on programs for the education of handicapped children. The remainder of the funds may be distributed to local education agencies on the basis of Statewide competitions.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: Title IV-C is being used to support citizen competency projects for elementary and secondary school students in a number of States, especially those where citizen education has been designated as a priority by the State education agency or local education agencies.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES:

Fulton County School System (Atlanta, Ga.) has initiated a 3-year project to develop, test, and implement a comprehensive K-12 citizenship program model in the social studies curriculum of the school system; once completed, this model will be disseminated to other school districts for possible replication.

Four school systems in North Carolina -- Wake, Durham, Edenton, and Greensboro -- are collaborating on a teacher training and curriculum development project for grades 3-12. The purpose is to introduce teachers of citizen education to instructional methods (for example, use of audio-visual aids, role-playing, action learning) and to provide exposure to curricular elements such as law-related education, global perspectives, or ethical reasoning. Goals for the project were developed by committees of educators and citizens and include four areas: knowledge, problem-solving skills, positive attitudes toward government, and development of responsibility.

Keene School System (Keene, N.H.) has been involved in a futures project for the past 3 years. In-service training for teachers was used to determine skills needed by students in preparing for the future. Skills identified included problem solving, critical thinking, forecasting, scenario writing, etc. Curricular materials were then developed, and incorporated into the school program.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding for the Title IV-C program was \$192,176,558. Of this amount, approximately \$50.8 million was used for strengthening State departments of education; \$21.2 million for

handicapped projects, and \$9.2 million for State administration.

PROGRAM NAME,	National Diffusion Network
ADDRESS, AND	Division of Educational Replication
LEGISLATIVE	U.S. Office of Education
AUTHORITY:	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Education Amendments of 1974,
	Section 402 (Special Projects Act)
	and General Education Provisions
	Act, Section 422(a)

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Federally-funded educational programs, approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel..

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The National Diffusion Network (NDN) distributes information about exemplary Federally-funded educational programs to interested school districts and other educational institutions, and provides assistance to school districts which may wish to adapt and install key elements of the successful programs. To be disseminated through the NDN, programs must first be nominated by a Federal project officer, and then receive approval from the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) located in the office of the Assistant Secretary for Education. JDRP approval will be granted only if the program has demonstrated a positive impact on participants. Once approved, a program is eligible to receive funds through the NDN as a Developer/Demonstrator in order "to provide materials, training, and technical assistance to interested adopters."4/ The NDN also funds State facilitators who link Developer/Demonstrator Projects with interested school districts.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The NDN can be used to disseminate information about effective, Federally-funded citizen education programs, and to provide assistance to school districts in adapting a program. To date, only one of 210 projects approved

by the JDRP is a citizen education project but others could be approved. At present, only 80 of the 210 projects have received funding to become Developer/Demonstrator Projects; the citizen education project has been funded for this purpose.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: The Institute for Political and Legal Education, located in New Jersey, has received approval for dissemination through the NDN, and has received funding to become a Developer/Demonstrator Project. This program emphasizes both the acquisition of skills and knowledge as well as the participation of students in classroom/school activities and in the community, particularly in local and State agencies. The curriculum has four components that may be used sequentially, or as independent mini-courses. These include: voter education; government: the decisionmaking process; individual rights; and fair trial/free press.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: Approximate average funding for Developer/Demonstrator Projects is \$45-50,000; Total FY 1978 funding for NDN was \$7 million.

PROGRAM NAME,	Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program
ADDRESS, AND	Close-Up Foundation
LEGISLATIVE	1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
AUTHORITY:	Washington, D.C. 20007
	Public Law 92-506, extended by
	Public Law 94-277.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Economically disadvantaged students, i.e., average family income of approximately \$8,500, and their teachers.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program, named for the late Senator from Louisiana, provides funds for disadvantaged high school students and their teachers to participate in a political education program, Close-Up. This program provides participants with an intensive, 1-week experience in Washington, D.C. where the Federal

Government is viewed "close-up" through meetings with representatives from the various branches of Government, lobbyists, journalists, etc. Ellender Fellowships ensure that Close-Up participants represent diverse backgrounds -- that both disadvantaged as well as affluent students are able to participate. Each year, specific geographic areas throughout the country are selected to participate in the program. Once selected, all of the schools within the areas are invited to participate and are provided with two Ellender Fellowships -- one for a student and one for a teacher.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION:

This is the only USOE program whose total mission is citizen education. The fellowships reach approximately 3,200 individuals annually; these individuals represent 1,600 schools located in 24 States.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: The Close-Up Program includes both workshops and seminars with persons involved in Government and politics, as well as curriculum materials which discuss public issues, the workings of Government, and public policy. Recently, a number of local close-up programs have been established. Initiated by students and teachers upon their return from an experience in Washington, D.C., these programs apply the Federal experiential learning model to community and State issues.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: Fellowships are administered by the Close-Up Foundation, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization funded through a combination of public and private contributions. The Close-Up Foundation has an annual budget of approximately \$5 million. Of this amount, in FY 1978, \$750,000 was provided by the Ellender Fellowship Program. In this context, the Ellender Fellowships provide a basis upon which the Close-Up Foundation can generate additional monies through private and civic contributions and through student tuition. In 1977-78, a total of

11,768 individuals participated in the Close-Up Program; of this number only 25 percent were Ellender Fellowship recipients. For those individuals who receive Ellender Fellowships, the fellowships provide only 50 percent of the monies needed for the Close-Up experience; the remainder is raised through local contributions.

PROGRAM NAME,	Adult Education
ADDRESS, AND	U.S. Office of Education
LEGISLATIVE	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
AUTHORITY:	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Adult Education Act, P.L. 91-230

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Funds are distributed to States and territories which award grants to local education agencies, and public and private nonprofit agency programs.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Adult Education Program is designed to eliminate functional illiteracy among the Nation's adults 16 years of age and older. For this purpose, grants are made to the States and territories to help educationally disadvantaged adults develop functional competencies. The amount of a State grant is determined by a formula based on the number of adults within the State who lack high school equivalency and who are not enrolled in school.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: A principal goal of the USOE Adult Education Program is the education of disadvantaged adults for civic responsibility. As a result, major work has been undertaken to identify the competencies needed for effective adult functioning in the areas of Government and law and community resources.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Between 1971 and 1976, an Adult Performance Level (API) Study, conducted by the University of Texas with funding from the Adult Education Program, identified adult competencies in Government and law and community

resources, as well as competencies in three other content and four skills areas. Performance indicators for these competencies were then developed, field tested, and revised, resulting in a national assessment of adult functional competency levels. At present, a number of State adult education programs have further identified these competencies, and have begun developing curriculums designed to prepare adult participants for civic involvement. One example of such a curriculum is provided by the Political/Legal Coping Skills Project developed by the Institute for Political Legal Education under contract with the New Jersey State Adult Education Program. This project developed four curriculum modules which combine the knowledge of Government and law with basic skills in communication. Written at two levels -- 4-5 grade reading level and 7-8 grade reading level -- the modules include the following topics: "What if...you want to cast a ballot?"; "What if...you wanted to register to vote?"; "What if...you think there ought to be a law?"; and "What if .you are arrested?"

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding for the Adult Education Program was \$90,750,000. In addition to the State grant program referenced earlier, funds are used to support the operation of Clearinghouse ADELL, an information/referral service for the adult education field.

PROGRAM NAME,	Community Services and Continuing
ADDRESS, AND	Education
LEGISLATIVE	U.S. Office of Education
AUTHORITY:	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Higher Education Act, Title I,
	Part A

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Funds are distributed to the States through the State grant component; institutions of higher education are then eligible to apply to designated State agencies. Institutions of higher education may apply directly to the Community Services and

Continuing Education Office, USOE, for funding under the Special Projects Component.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Community Services and Continuing Education (CSCE) Program has as its basic mission the implementation of "the concept of education as a continuing, lifelong and dynamic process through which adults can lead more meaningful and useful lives, and through which concerned communities can improve their functioning".^{5/} To accomplish this mission, the CSCE Program has two components: State grants and special projects. These are used to provide resources to support both community service and continuing education programs in colleges and universities.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The CSCE Program has funded a variety of educational activities designed to increase citizen competency in public affairs. Specifically, the CSCE Program has been used to provide a forum through which citizens in communities can identify and examine critical local problems, develop ways to solve those problems, and enhance their problem-solving skills.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Numerous examples of civic competency projects funded by CSCE are available, but the following sampler should provide an idea of the variety of civic concerns addressed:

Big Bend Community College (Mose Lake, Wash.) sponsored a Citizen and Decisionmaking Competency and Involvement Project which attempted to raise the level of citizen competency in dealing with Government;

Washington University (St. Louis) held 1-day conferences and weekend retreats to acquaint inner city adults with the use of technology, social planning, economics, and the law in solving urban problems;

A variety of institutions such as Johns Hopkins, University of Minnesota, and City University of New York have involved low-income residents of the inner city in

housing and neighborhood rehabilitation projects;

University of Alaska developed a program to help residents of new towns understand the incorporation process, the boundaries of Government authority, and citizen responsibility; and

Wenatchee Valley College (Wenatchee, Wash.) sponsored a project, Grass Roots Government: Enablement and Involvement in the Democratic Process. Through this project, major local issues were explored through a variety of mechanisms, including a weekly radio program, Viewpoints.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding for the CSCE Program is \$18 million. Ten percent is utilized for special projects; 90 percent for the State grants component. In the State grants program, monies are provided to the States on a formula basis; States are required to match at least one-third of the CSCE grant, but often match more. Designated State agencies determine priorities under the State grants component.

PROGRAM NAME,	Consumer Education
ADDRESS, AND	Office of Consumers Education
LEGISLATIVE	U.S. Office of Education
AUTHORITY:	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Education Amendments of 1974,
	Part IV, Section 407

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Local education agencies, State education agencies, institutions of higher education, and public and private nonprofit agencies.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The USOE Consumer Education Program promotes new approaches for educating and informing consumers about their role as participants in the marketplace. For this purpose, grants and contracts are awarded for research, demonstration, training and development, and dissemination of information about curriculums and other materials.

Specifically, the program "educates people to recognize market place alternatives, and to make rational choices in light of their personal values, their citizenship responsibilities, and social, economic, and ecological considerations."7/

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The Education Program has funded a number of projects which enable participants to (1) become more effective consumer advocates before public institutions; and (2) become knowledgeable about consumer law and the small claims court procedure.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Examples of several consumer education projects which have a citizen education-related component include: Consumer Education for Access conducted by Massachusetts Fair Share, Inc. (Boston). This project recognized that citizens who need access to decisionmakers of public regulated utilities often do not possess the information, resources, technical skills, or capital to participate in adversary proceedings against these utilities. The project was designed to enable consumers to advocate their position regarding the consumption of services produced by State-regulated industries. It provided participants with skills training in how to define the specifics of an issue, how to affect the outcome of decisions, and how to locate access points in the decisionmaking process. In addition, consumers were offered legal and technical assistance during the advocacy process. Consumer Education Training for Client Advocates conducted by Central Area Motivation Program (Seattle). This project was targeted toward 450 statewide client advocates in 75+ community organizations and agencies that serve low income and elderly populations. Through the project, a manual which emphasized tenant-landlord law, consumer utility rights, small claims court procedures, etc., was updated for use in workshops with client advocates.8/ It should be noted that the Consumers Education Office recently funded the production of a publication, "Consumer and Citizen

Education Today"; a comparative analysis of the key assumptions underlying each of the fields. It was produced by the Mershon Center, Ohio State University, Columbus.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding level for the Consumer Education Program was approximately \$4 million.

PROGRAM NAME	Environmental Education
ADDRESS, AND	U.S. Office of Education
LEGISLATIVE	400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
AUTHORITY:	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Environmental Education Act of 1970

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: General Projects: institutions of higher education, State or local educational agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions, including libraries and museums. Mini-grant Projects: public or nonprofit private organizations. Preference is given to local citizens' groups and volunteer organizations working in the environmental field.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Environmental Education Program was specifically designed to promote understanding of the problems, issues, and options related to environmental quality through the development of educational resources. To meet program goals, mini-grants, general project grants, and contracts are awarded on the basis of national competitions. The mini-grants are usually used to conduct community workshops on an issue such as energy or land use. General project grants are awarded for (1) resource materials development; (2) educational personnel development; (3) elementary and secondary education; and (4) community education. Contracts are awarded for the design, development, and/or piloting of environmental education curriculums for school and community use, as well as to pilot a regional environmental learning system.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: At the heart of the Environmental Education Program is the inherent belief that informed individuals will be able to participate more effectively in public decisions and policies related to the environment, and ultimately will be more capable of solving environmental problems.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Project SCATE (Students Concerned About Tomorrow's Environment), a State-wide project in Iowa, provides an "interdisciplinary approach to environmental education that emphasizes active student participation in the investigation of local environmental problems and in the political process necessary to implement solutions to problems." A key project feature involves environmental investigations to develop solutions to environmental problems. Participating students select one of four issues to investigate; e.g., air and water quality, land use policy development, energy allocation and consumption, and economic considerations related to the quality of life; they then identify and present alternative solutions with supporting arguments to the Iowa general assembly. Students also testify at public hearings, write letters to governmental officials, etc. about the results of their investigations.^{9/} In 1976, the Five-County Association of Governments (St. George, Utah) held a 2-day seminar entitled "Assessing the Environmental Impacts of Energy-Related Development of Southwestern Utah. The purpose was "to provide education on environmental and socioeconomic issues, and to develop county and area...public policy statements which might be used to provide...direction to future planning for and management of growth and development in Southwestern Utah." Workshop participants included representatives from agriculture, business, the media, and schools; and officials from Federal, State, and local government.^{10/}

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: In FY 1978, the Environmental Program was funded at \$3.5 million. In FY 1977, \$244,341 was used for mini-grant workshops;

\$2.1 million was used for general project grants -- resource material development, personnel development, elementary and secondary education, and community education; the remainder of the funding, \$1.155 million, was used for contracts.

PROGRAM NAME,	International Studies Centers
ADDRESS, AND	Program
LEGISLATIVE	Division of International Education
AUTHORITY	U.S. Office of Education
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	National Defense Education Act,
	Title VI

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Institutions of higher education.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: To strengthen teaching in modern languages and area studies, the International Studies Centers Program provides for the establishment of international studies centers in institutions of higher education. These centers are of two types: those that offer both graduate and undergraduate instruction, and others that have only undergraduate courses. Centers may focus on one world region with courses in its principal languages, history, politics, etc., or they may use an international or comparative multi-disciplinary approach. Currently, 80 centers are funded through this program. As part of their operating requirements, centers must utilize the equivalent of 20 percent of their funding for outreach activities to the community, schools, businesses, State educational agencies, and other institutions of higher education.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: These centers provide resources through which issues of international consequence can be addressed, studied, and debated. Individuals learn about the history, culture, etc., of other world regions; this information can be useful in helping them to evaluate international policies and actions.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: In 1977, a short course entitled "The Future of Chinese-American Relations" was offered for business executives by the Harvard University Language and Area Center for East Asian Studies; The East Asian Project in Education is a collaborative effort between the Boston Children's Museum and Harvard University's Language and Area Center for East Asian Studies. This project encourages and assists in the use of materials on China and Japan in elementary and secondary schools.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 78 funding for the International Studies Centers Program was almost \$8 million.

PROGRAM NAME,	Graduate and Undergraduate
ADDRESS, AND	International Studies Program
LEGISLATIVE	International Education Division
AUTHORITY	U.S. Office of Education
	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	National Defense Education Act,
	Title VI

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Institutions of higher education.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Graduate and Undergraduate International Studies Program awards grants and contracts to establish and operate graduate and undergraduate international studies programs. The graduate component of the program promotes the development of international components in presently existing course offerings, and the development of new methods for teaching international studies. The undergraduate

component promotes the development of an effective international perspective in undergraduate general education programs, particularly during the first 2 years of postsecondary study.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: This program provides a forum for the exploration and debate of global issues. The information provided may help students become more effective evaluators of international policies and actions.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: In 1977-78, Gustavus Adolphus College (St. Peter, Minn.) was awarded a grant to operate a program of world development education. Project objectives included providing students with (1) an understanding of global conditions and problems that affect their lives; (2) a base for evaluating the capability of the present policies and structures of national and international systems to manage emerging interdependent problems; (3) skills in value analysis, conflict resolution, and cross-cultural sensitivity to help them to participate more actively in local, regional, national, and international attempts to deal with emerging global problems; and (4) the ability to see linkages between personal values and life styles, and the impact of those values and life styles upon people in an interdependent world. Through this program, a campus-wide lecture series, open to members of the community, was conducted. Topics in this series included: "The Foreign Policies of Third World Leaders," "Strengths and Weaknesses of the United Nations System," and "Basic Dimensions of the North-South Conflict." In addition, the college infused its existing curriculum with course modules of world development education.^{6/}

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding for the Graduate International Studies Program was \$565,000; funding for the Undergraduate International Studies Program was \$875,000.

PROGRAM NAME, ADDRESS, AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY: Fulbright-Hays International Studies Branch
Division of International Education
U.S. Office of Education
7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
Washington, D.C. 20202
Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961
(Section 102(b)(6)); the
Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954
(Section 104(b)(2) and (3)).

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Group projects abroad: U.S. educational institutions or nonprofit educational organizations. Foreign curriculum consultants: State departments of education, local public school systems, higher education institutions, nonprofit educational organizations, or various combinations of such institutions.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: To improve American understanding of and upgrade instruction in foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs, the Fulbright-Hays Program supports group projects and faculty and doctoral dissertation work abroad for research, training, and curriculum development. In addition, the program helps bring foreign curriculum consultants here to assist in upgrading international and intercultural education in U.S. schools and colleges.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The Fulbright-Hays Program provides opportunities for American scholars to become more knowledgeable about other world regions, and helps upgrade international and intercultural education in U.S. schools and colleges. It promotes international understanding, equipping Americans to more effectively evaluate international policies.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Group Projects Abroad--In the summer of 1977 and the 1977-78

academic year, 44 Group Project Abroad grants were made to institutions of higher education, State education agencies, and nonprofit organizations in 19 States. The projects were conducted in a variety of countries including Japan, India, Egypt, and West Africa. They involved grants to U.S. educational institutions or nonprofit educational organizations for training, research, curriculum development, and/or instructional materials preparation or acquisition in international and intercultural studies. Participants were selected from college and university faculty members, experienced elementary and secondary school teachers, curriculum supervisors and administrators, and selected higher education students specializing in foreign language and area studies. Programs provided intensive, advanced-level language training, and opportunities to develop curriculum and teaching methods in cross-cultural understanding and area studies. The Foreign Curriculum Consultant program enables education, local public school systems, higher education institutions, nonprofit educational organizations, or various combinations of such institutions to bring educators from other countries to the United States for an academic year (usually 8 to 10 months) to assist in planning and developing curriculums in modern foreign languages and area studies. In the 1977-78 academic year, Foreign Curriculum Consultant grants were provided to 16 eligible U.S. institutions. Through this program, foreign educators from a variety of countries including Sweden, Nigeria, Taiwan, and Argentina helped to improve the study of their respective countries in American educational institutions.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: The 1978 FY funding level for the Fulbright-Hays Program was \$5 million -- \$3 million in U.S. dollars, and \$2 million in foreign currencies.

PROGRAM NAME, ADDRESS, AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY: Ethnic Heritage Studies
U.S. Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
Washington, D.C. 20202
Elementary and Secondary Education
Act, as amended, Title IX

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Public or private nonprofit educational agencies, institutions, or organizations; these may include ethnic, community, and professional associations as well as local and State educational agencies and higher education institutions.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, established in 1972, attempts "to develop intercultural understanding within our culturally pluralistic society."^{11/} To accomplish this goal, the program has funded various projects focusing on the concerns either of a single ethnic group, several ethnic groups, or all ethnic groups. Program resources are used to develop curriculum materials for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary institutions; to disseminate these materials to the various schools; and to train people to use them.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The Ethnic Heritage Studies program, by fostering intercultural understanding, can encourage social harmony and mutual understanding among peoples of the United States with diverse backgrounds and cultures. The program's mandate states that by promoting "a greater understanding of the contribution of one's own heritage and those of one's fellow citizens, one can contribute to a more harmonious, patriotic, and committed populace."^{12/}

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: The program has supported projects which examine the political cultures of ethnic groups and the ways in which they have contributed to the American political system. Other projects have promoted dialog among ethnic communities about to be affected by desegregation

orders; they have led to the preparation of analytic instruments for teachers to use in detecting stereotypes and racism depicted in textbooks; and they have endeavored to examine in diverse ways the cultural variety of the American heritage.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding for the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program was approximately \$2.3 million. Funding priorities are now focusing on training personnel and disseminating materials, signaling a shift away from the early emphasis on developing curriculum materials.

PROGRAM NAME,	Teacher Centers Program
ADDRESS, AND	U.S. Office of Education
LEGISLATIVE	1832 M Street, N.W.
AUTHORITY:	Washington, D.C. 20036
	Education Amendments of 1976

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Local education associations and institutions of higher education.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The recently established Teacher Centers Program provides grants to establish and operate teacher centers. The purpose of these centers is to provide teachers in elementary and secondary schools with opportunities for in-service training and curriculum development which specifically meet their needs and which will assist them in better serving their students. The program in this first year of actual operation will provide funds for approximately 55 to 65 teacher centers located in either 35 or 36 states. The majority of these centers will be operated by local educational agencies. State departments of education will play a major role in establishing teacher centers. Specifically, they will review all proposals for teacher centers from within their particular States and recommend to USOE which proposals should be funded. In addition, they will provide technical assistance to and disseminate information from funded projects.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The Teacher Centers Program could serve as a valuable resource in developing, expanding, and improving citizen activities offered in public schools by providing a mechanism for training teachers in new approaches to citizen education and for developing citizen education curriculums. To be used in this capacity, however, the teacher center policy board, the local operating body responsible for supervising the center, would have to designate citizen education as a priority.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: None to date. The program has just recently been established.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: In FY 78, the Teacher Centers Program was funded for \$8.25 million. Funding for each center during the program's first year of operation will range from approximately \$9,000 to \$850,000, depending on service area size and identified needs.

PROGRAM NAME,	Educational Television Programming
ADDRESS, AND	U.S. Office of Education
LEGISLATIVE	Division of Educational Technology
AUTHORITY:	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Special Projects Act, Section 402

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Profit and nonprofit organizations; academic and nonacademic institutions; commercial and independent television producers; and public television stations.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: To provide learning opportunities for children, youth, and adults, contracts are awarded through this program for the development, production, evaluation, dissemination, and utilization of innovative educational television or radio programs. Priorities are established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and Federal experts. To date, innovative educational television program efforts supported through the Division of Educational

technology include: language development for pre-school children (partial support for the "Sesame Street" series); alcohol and drug abuse for adolescents and adults; music for grades 4-6; and the role of parents in pre-school child development (the Footsteps series).

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The educational television component of the U.S. Office of Education has the potential of developing an innovative television/radio series on citizen education for young children, youth, and/or adults. Consideration was once given to developing a series on the "Bill of Rights", indicating an interest in the subject area.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: None to date.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: FY 1978 funding for the Educational Television Programming Section of the Special Projects Act was \$5 million.

PROGRAM NAME,	Grant Program to Promote Cultural
ADDRESS, AND	Understanding
LEGISLATIVE	International Education Division
AUTHORITY	U.S. Office of Education
	7th and D Streets, S.W., ROB #3
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	1972 Amendments, Title VI,
	National Defense Education Act

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Institutions of higher education; State and local education agencies; professional associations; educational consortiums; and teacher associations.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: This program is designed to "stimulate locally designed educational programs to increase the understanding of cultures and actions of other nations in order to better evaluate the international and domestic impact of major National

policies."13/

RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: This program could help citizens make "informed judgments with respect to the international policies and actions of the United States."14/

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: None, to date.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: As stipulated by legislation, this program cannot be funded until at least \$15 million has first been made available for funding sections 601 and 602 of the National Defense Education Act, Title VI. This has not yet occurred.

USOE PROGRAMS WHICH INDIRECTLY CONTRIBUTE TO CITIZEN EDUCATION

A number of programs located within the U.S. Office of Education have an indirect role in citizen education because they provide opportunities for citizen participation in their activities. Involvement in these programs may contribute indirectly to an enhancement of civic competency on the part of participants through the development of participation skills in such areas as individual and group decisionmaking, public speaking, political advocacy, and so forth. Through such involvement, citizen participants may gain skills that might impact upon public decisionmaking, and thereby influence public policy. In addition, skills gained through this involvement may be transferable to other public settings.

The most detailed information on citizen participation requirements of USOE programs to date, appears in a study "Citizen Organizations: A Study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking," conducted by the Institute for Responsive Education (IRE) for the National Institute of Education. As part of a 3-year effort scheduled for completion in May 1979, the IRE

reviewed the citizen participation requirements of all USOE programs. Findings revealed that of the 106 USOE programs, 77 had a participatory requirement, usually in the form of a National advisory committee. In addition, six of the programs had a State advisory committee requirement and eight programs "require a continuing advisory committee at the local level."^{15/} Since the publication of this IRE report, a requirement for community councils was added to Teacher Corps legislation. In addition, the Community Education Program is based on the philosophy of community involvement.

For purposes of this analysis, USOE programs with mandates for ongoing citizen involvement at the local level are viewed to be most critical because they provide a mechanism for ensuring that grassroots citizen involvement is an integral, continuing part of program operations. This mechanism which provides for a continual, as opposed to sporadic involvement, offers a greater potential for more stable learning experiences to occur over time. USOE programs which have such citizen participation mechanisms include:

- Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act

- Bilingual Education Follow Through.

- Title IV, Elementary and Secondary Education Act

- Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)

- Community Education

- Teacher Corps

- Indian Education Act, Part A

- Ethnic Heritage Studies

- Education of Handicapped Act, Part B

Currently, knowledge about the extent of mandated citizen participation in these USOE programs is limited. The Institute for Responsive Education, as part of its research effort, estimated that "there are 14,000 district level Title I Parent Advisory Committees and 44,000 building level committees with approximately 900,000 members. Head Start, Follow Through, and other district and building committees account for at least 150,000 additional participants.^{16/} It is

difficult to estimate the numbers of local committees and citizen participants in other programs because data are lacking.

Very little is known about the effectiveness of citizen participation in these programs. The IRE study maintains that "the effectiveness of Federally mandated committees varies widely and is strongly influenced by political variables -- the history and tradition of politics and decisionmaking in school and community; intergroup relations in a school, district, and in a State."17/

A recently funded USOE study of parent participation in four programs -- Follow Through, Title I, Bilingual Education, and the Emergency School Aid Act -- should provide some new information in this area. Specifically, this study will attempt to identify patterns of parent participation in these programs, and factors which inhibit or facilitate parent effectiveness in such areas as decisionmaking, planning, and goal setting. This type of information is needed in order to assess the degree to which citizen participation is having an impact upon program decisionmaking.

Even less is known about the impact of citizen involvement in these USOE programs on the development of individual skills for civic affairs and the extent to which training to develop such skills is provided to participants. An IRE study emphasizes that "in several laws and regulations there are specific references to the needs and rights of committees for information, training, or assistance, but only in rare exceptions do the citizen groups believe that they are given adequate help, information, or training."18/ In those instances where training is provided, information about the nature and extent of that training is limited; specifically, it is difficult to determine whether training related to skills development in public decisionmaking is provided.

PART II: OTHER AGENCIES

Resources for citizen education exist in other segments of the Education Division -- notably the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the National Institute of Education. Their activities are described in this section.

Other Federal agencies also contribute to citizen education directly through grants/contracts and indirectly through their provisions for citizen participation in decisionmaking. In order to give an idea of direct Federal resources for citizen education, a sampling of pertinent programs in three agencies is described here. These include programs in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. An examination of some of their activities should help illustrate how citizen education relates to the mission of other Federal agencies. The appendix provides guidance to funding sources throughout the Federal Government which can be used to identify additional programs.

PROGRAM NAME,	Fund for the Improvement of Post-
ADDRESS, AND	Secondary Education
LEGISLATIVE	Education Division, HEW
AUTHORITY:	400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
	Washington, D.C. 20202
	Education Amendments Act of 1972

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Higher and postsecondary educational institutions, including profit and nonprofit, private, trade, technical, and business schools. Also, educational organizations and agencies such as student and faculty associations, trustees, State agencies, and other governmental organizations. Also such educational service providers as museums and libraries.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) was established to promote reform, improvement, and innovation in postsecondary education. There are eight purposes for which grants and contracts may be awarded:

- (1) encouraging the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education and providing equal educational opportunity for all;
- (2) creating institutions and programs that involve new directions in career and professional training, and new combinations of academic and experiential learning;
- (3) establishing institutions and programs based on communications technology;
- (4) implementing changes within the internal structure and operations of postsecondary institutions designed to elucidate institutional priorities and purposes;
- (5) designing and introducing cost-effective methods of instruction and operations;
- (6) introducing institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities to enter and re-enter institutions, and to pursue programs of study particularly designed to fit individual needs;
- (7) introducing reforms in graduate education, in the structure of the academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculty; and
- (8) creating new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and introducing reforms in current institutional practices related to these matters.

FIPSE holds an annual Comprehensive Program Competition to help achieve its stated purposes; through this competition the Fund encourages the submission of proposals which do not adhere to any strict category of grant activity. FIPSE provides guidance for this process through its annual "Program Information and Application Procedures."

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: FIPSE can be utilized to improve civic education in many ways at the postsecondary level. For example, through its broad mandate, innovation in curriculum materials, teacher training, and instructional approaches could be promoted; also, the Fund could support projects which encourage student participation in civic activities.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Recently, FIPSE has supported a number of citizen-related activities. A few of these include: Pacific Lutheran University (Tacoma, Wash.). A 3-year demonstration program is being conducted to prepare students to become effective participants in the decisionmaking processes of both public and private institutions. Through this program, it is anticipated that students will gain skills and knowledge about how to effectively influence decisionmaking in both public and organizational contexts. University of Michigan, Residential College (Ann Arbor). The social science community within the residential college developed a futures-oriented project which explored ways of preparing students to live in the 21st century. This project explored (1) the viability of using social science methodology to encourage citizen evaluation of social issues; (2) developing coping skills for meeting emerging trends; and (3) developing approaches to affect future social patterns. An anticipated student outcome of this project is the ability to comprehend major issues and trends of the late 20th century and to identify community, regional, national, and global problems that could be researched within the umbrella of the residential college social science program.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: The FY 78 funding level for FIPSE was \$12 million. Projects range from 1 to 3 years' duration; individual project funding levels range from \$10,000 - \$200,000.

PROGRAM NAME,	National Institute of Education
ADDRESS, AND	Education Division, HEW
LEGISLATIVE	19th and M Streets, N.W.
AUTHORITY:	Washington, D.C. 20036
	Education Amendments of 1972

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Educational institutions and organizations; nonprofit and private research firms; other relevant organizations.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: Since its establishment in 1972, the National Institute of Education has encouraged equality of educational opportunity by promoting, developing, and disseminating new and improved educational practices and products. In addition, the Institute has attempted to use scientific knowledge to support educational policies and practices, and to develop and sustain a national educational research and development system. To accomplish this mission, the agency is currently organized into three groups: Teaching and Learning; Educational Policy and Organization; and Dissemination and the Improvement of Practice.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: On a very limited basis, NIE has supported projects designed to build knowledge about citizen education. As the Federal educational research and development agency, NIE has the potential to support additional research efforts in the area; but, to date, interest in funding such efforts has been minimal.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Research for Better Schools Study (Philadelphia, Pa.) - For several years, Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS), has been involved in a series of studies designed to build knowledge about the concept of citizen education. Serving the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, RBS is now conducting a two-phase contract for NIE. Just completed, the first phase brought together historians and psychologists at two conferences to determine their latest thinking about the subject of citizen education. The second phase of this contract is currently underway. RBS staff members are conducting preliminary activities with teachers and administrators at four school sites (two each in Pennsylvania and New Jersey) to develop citizen education programs in those schools; simultaneously, RBS plans to study the process of innovation as it occurs through these activities. It is this latter focus on the process of innovation that is NIE's major interest in the study. Knowledge Interpretation Program, Dissemination Division - NIE recently issued a series of Requests

for Proposals (RFP) that ask potential contractors to gather research findings in three areas: educational equity, nonacademic influences on education, and citizen education. Contractors are then required to interpret these findings in a form useful to school districts, and to disseminate the materials to school districts across the country via workshops and conferences. NIE expects to award three to five contracts on the basis of these RFP's by September 30, 1978. Summaries of research findings should be available by June 1979.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS: A SAMPLER OF OTHER AGENCIES

PROGRAM NAME,	Community Anti-Crime Program
ADDRESS, AND	Office of Community Anti-Crime
LEGISLATIVE	Programs
AUTHORITY:	Law Enforcement Assistance
	Administration
	Washington, D.C. 20531
	Omnibus Crime Control and Safe
	Streets Act of 1968 as amended
	by the Crime Control Act of 1976.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Incorporated nonprofit community/neighborhood organizations. No grants to local governments.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: This program supports community and neighborhood-based projects designed to promote a collective response to crime at the neighborhood level. It is a competitive, discretionary grants program. Usually funds from this program go to support such activities as neighborhood patrols, tenant security programs, child protective services, victim assistance, and resident-based counseling services.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: While citizen education projects have not often been supported in the past, the director of the program stated that they would be related to the program's mandate. "An integral part of our program," he said, "is educating citizens

in the political process...teaching them how to understand and work with their local government's institutions, the courts, the police, to close the gap between what the community needs from these institutions and what it is receiving."

POTENTIAL CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES; As part of an action-oriented anti-crime program, the following educational components: a series of workshops on community/police relations, involving members of the police force in presentations about what they do in evolving areas of policy, or their view of the community and its needs; a neighborhood course on the community's anti-crime resources, including visits to the courts, police stations, city hall, State legislature, or public service organizations.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: \$15 million in FY 1978.

PROGRAM NAME,	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
ADDRESS, AND	Prevention Office
LEGISLATIVE	Law Enforcement Assistance
AUTHORITY:	Administration
	Washington, D.C. 20531
	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
	Prevention Act of 1974, as
	amended by the Juvenile and
	Delinquency Prevention Amendments
	of 1977.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Varies from program to program.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Office encompasses four programs or divisions. These are: (1) Formula Grants and Technical Assistance; (2) Special Emphasis Prevention and Treatment Program; (3) the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP); and (4) the Concentration of Federal Effort Program within the Policy and Planning Division. Formula Grants to State Planning Agencies (SPA's) are designed to increase the capacity of State and local governments

to conduct effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs through matching grants to each State's SPA. Each SPA must develop a State plan that meets the requirements of Federal guidelines. Eligible applicants that apply to SPA's for competitively awarded funds are: units of State and local government, public and private organizations and agencies involved in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. Special Emphasis Prevention and Treatment grants help develop and implement programs that support effective approaches, techniques, and methods for controlling and preventing juvenile delinquency. Approaches include development and utilization of community-based alternatives to traditional forms of official justice system processing; improvement of the capability of public and private agencies to provide delinquency prevention services to youths and their families; development of new approaches and techniques for reducing school dropouts, unwanted suspensions and expulsions; and through support of advocacy by groups committed to protection and improvement of the legal rights and welfare of youths. Each year this division establishes a set of priorities for funding program and discretionary grants. NIJJDP attempts to educate youth about their responsibilities and entitlements under law. General objectives are to provide juveniles with (1) knowledge of practical law useful in their everyday lives; (2) understanding of the policies, rationales, and concepts upon which laws are based; (3) analytical skills necessary for law-related problem solving in a complex society, and (4) the requisite lay advocacy abilities to put that knowledge into practice.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: Citizen education and participation are priorities under these programs. There is interest in educating citizens about such issues as deinstitutionalizing juvenile offenders, or improving the juvenile justice system under the Special Emphasis Program. NIJJDP, which funds research, development, evaluation, training, dissemination, and the development and implementation of standards for

juvenile justice, is a source of support for law-related education projects, among other activities.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: The need to provide better and more equitable services for young women who come in contact with the juvenile justice system is the topic of one project under consideration for discretionary funding. Training on this topic would be provided at a national conference and regional meetings, while representatives from a number of local organizations would be trained to conduct similar workshops at the community level. NIJJDP is funding a series of law-related education projects under the direction of the American Bar Association, Children's Legal Rights Information Program, Constitutional Rights Foundation, Law in a Free Society, the National Street Law Institute, and Phi Alpha Delta, a legal fraternity. This 2-year pilot program aims at incorporating existing projects within the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools, and arranging for involvement of law students and other community resource persons as teachers in the projects. The American Bar Association will serve as coordinator and clearinghouse for the project. An outside evaluation will be conducted.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: For fiscal year 1978, \$63.7 million went to Formula Grants and Technical Assistance; \$49.5 million to Special Emphasis Prevention and Treatment; \$16 million to NIJJDP; and \$1 million to the Concentration of Federal Effort Program.

PROGRAM NAME,	Higher Education Project Program
ADDRESS, AND	National Endowment for the
LEGISLATIVE	Humanities (NEH)
AUTHORITY:	Washington, D.C. 20506

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: College, universities, and 2-year colleges. (Other organizations may apply but their applications will not be competitive unless their proposed relationship to the formal curriculum of an educational institution is well-defined.)

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: This program supports demonstration projects which develop and test imaginative approaches to the teaching of a particular subject within the humanities. Three categories of grants are offered: (1) Humanities Institutes Grants, which emphasize the training of faculty; (2) Curriculum Materials Grants, which support the development of materials that address a special need in the humanities; (3) General Projects Grants, which are those grants that fall outside the two other categories.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: NEH supports education and public activity in the humanities, legislatively defined to include "law, history, ethics, political theory...and other subjects concerned with questions of value." NEH can therefore support only citizen education projects that fall within this framework. Included would be projects to increase citizens' understanding of the political system, and their rights and responsibilities under it, as well as projects that would encourage citizens to examine the ethical and other value-related questions raised by alternative public policies, whether those policies are local, State, or Federal. Furthermore, the analytical tools and/or the substantive knowledge of the humanities must be employed in addressing these topics. Study of an issue will be supported; advocacy of a point of view on an issue will not.

POTENTIAL CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: College courses designed to provide adults enrolled in credit courses with the opportunities to learn more about American political theory, the lawmaking powers of governmental bodies, the ethical issues raised by our evolving philosophy of government (as reflected in Federal, State, and local government practices) -- these are all examples of fundable projects.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: For fiscal 1978, \$5 million was available for grants.

PROGRAM NAME, Elementary and Secondary
ADDRESS, AND Education Program
LEGISLATIVE Education Division
AUTHORITY: National Endowment for the
 Humanities
 Washington, D.C. 20506

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Schools, school systems, State education departments, private schools, educational institutions and organizations (including colleges and universities); institutions other than these are eligible to apply for support but their applications are unlikely to be competitive unless their proposed relationship to the formal curriculum of schools is well-defined.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The program is designed to strengthen teaching and learning of the humanities in the Nation's schools. Most grants support both the training of teachers and the development of new curriculums. Three types of grants are offered: (1) Extended Teacher Institute Grants, which provide summer training and school year in-service training (including curriculum development) to elementary and secondary school teachers; (2) Regional Development Grants, which support comprehensive reforms in humanities education throughout an entire school system, several school systems, or within a group of schools; (3) General Projects Grants, those grants that fall outside the other two grant categories.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: See description on page 43.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: Under this program, Law in a Free Society, Santa Monica, Calif., received funding to develop multi-media instructional units for a K-12 civic education curriculum. The units focus on eight civic concepts: justice, property diversity, authority, freedom, responsibility, privacy and participation. Global Perspectives in Education Inc., New York, received a 3-year grant to identify the

knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by citizens in an interdependent world. The program developers have used the concepts of conflict, change, interdependence, and communication to organize lessons in social studies and language arts courses for grades K-12.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: For fiscal year 1978, \$4.5 million was available for grants.

PROGRAM NAME,	Program Development
ADDRESS, AND	Division of Public Programs
LEGISLATIVE	National Endowment for the
AUTHORITY:	Humanities
	Washington, D.C. 20506

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Unrestricted (Restricted within a priority area, as indicated below).

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: This program makes a limited number of grants to test new ways of making the humanities more available to the adult public. Currently, the program is especially interested in two types of projects: (1) National Adult Organizations Projects (professional, civic, social, and service oriented voluntary organizations may apply); (2) Previously Undeveloped Public Programs (eligibility unrestricted). In all categories of support, grants are available both for planning and implementation.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: See description on page 43.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: The Institute for Study of Civic Values received a planning grant last year to develop course materials which will be used this year under a second grant. The new grant supports classes and seminars in schools and libraries for the general public of a Philadelphia neighborhood. The purpose is to motivate citizens to consider how they might participate in their urban institutions through an understanding of the historical and philosophical issues of

civic participation.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: For fiscal 1978, \$5 million was available for grants.

PROGRAM NAME,	The State Programs
ADDRESS, AND	Division of State Programs
LEGISLATIVE	National Endowment for the
AUTHORITY:	Humanities
	Washington, D.C. 20506

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations and institutions.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The program's purpose, in the words of the Endowment's legislative mandate, is to "increase public understanding and appreciation of the humanities." This mandate is interpreted in turn at the State level where a private volunteer citizens' committee in each State receives funds from the Endowment to make grants to nonprofit groups and organizations within the State. Each committee determines its own program, produces its own brochure and application form, and establishes its own procedure for selecting proposals.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The program's commitment to using the humanities to inform citizens on issues of public concern makes its tie to citizen education a close one. Most of the projects supported by the committees fall under this category, either because they deal with important public issues or are teaching citizens about the political circumstances that surround a particular issue in their State or region.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: In Maryland, the humanities committee is supporting a series of workshops on the subject of land use in one region of the State. Citizens and humanists are meeting together to examine the problems raised by pending policy decisions in the light of historical knowledge about the

area and previous policy decisions, and taking certain ethical and moral issues into account. In West Virginia, the 4-H Foundation of Pocahontas County is conducting a project called "Democracy - Citizen Influence on Public Policy." There will be a series of eight sessions. At the first four, citizens will join with public officials from the local courts, mayors of the nearby towns, and officials from local colleges to discuss their roles in the shaping of public policy from a humanistic and political science perspective. During the second four sessions, those attending will examine a locally controversial issue in the context of the first four discussions. That issue is land use in the county. Another project in West Virginia is convening members of the auto and coal mining unions together with management of those industries and scholars to discuss the topic of labor law in general, and the Taft-Hartley Act in particular.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: In fiscal 1978, \$18.5 million was available for this program.

PROGRAM NAME,	Science for Citizens Program
ADDRESS, AND	Office of Science and Society
LEGISLATIVE	Directorate for Science Education
AUTHORITY:	National Science Foundation
	Washington, D.C. 20550
	The National Science Foundation Act
	of 1950, as amended.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Citizens groups, educational institutions (colleges, universities, public libraries, or museums), professional or trade associations or trade unions, units of State or local government, or organizations operated primarily in the public interest. Individual scientists or engineers in association with public organizations with an interest in reaching the general citizenry can apply for Public Service Science Residencies.

PROGRAM PURPOSE/BACKGROUND: The goal of the program is to encourage citizens and scientists to work together

on science-related public policy issues. This goal has been translated into the following programs: Science for Citizens Forums, Conferences, and Workshops; Science for Citizens Planning Studies; and the Public Service Science Residencies Program.

RELATIONSHIP TO CITIZEN EDUCATION: The program's sole concern is to have citizens and scientists participate knowledgeably in the resolution of public issues that involve science and technology.

EXAMPLES OF CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES: In the past, Science for Citizens Forums, Conferences, and Workshops Program has supported a forum organized by the Town of Lexington, Massachusetts to bring scientists and citizens together to consider research on how human beings age. As a result, Lexington citizens and their elected officials expect to be better able to make policy decisions related to Government expenditures for health and other human services. A second project, sponsored by the Environmental Policy Institute and the Clean Water Fund, involves holding two regional conferences designed to help citizens in two regions of the country participate more effectively in choosing community sewage treatment facilities. The Public Service Science Residencies Program (which last year also included internships) offers grants to individuals to provide scientific and technical assistance to citizens and their organizations. In fiscal 1977, Dr. William A. Peterman received a grant to conduct five land use study projects with the assistance of members of local citizen groups in Toledo, Ohio as a way to help them participate in developing land use policy in their metropolitan area. Dr. Timothy Zorach, sponsored by the Maine Audubon Society, received a grant to conduct a series of public meetings and discussions across the State on the ecological functions of the State's wetlands. As a result of the meetings, citizens were to be assisted in developing a comprehensive approach for their State to the protection and management of these systems for their State.

RELEVANT FUNDING INFORMATION: For fiscal 1978, these programs were awarded about \$1.7 million.

NOTES

1

Education Commission of the States, National Assessment of Educational Progress, "Changes in Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1969-76. Selected Results from the Second National Assessments of Citizenship and Social Studies. Citizenship/Social Studies Report No. 07-CS-02." Prepared under Contract No. OEC-0-74-0506 with the National Center for Educational Statistics, January 1976, pp. 23-38.

2

Norvel Northcutt, et al., "Adult Functional Competency: Summary," Austin, Tex.: University of Texas at Austin, March 1975, p. 6.

3

Telephone Interview with Myron Judy, Institute for Political and Legal Education, August 1978.

4

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, "Educational Programs That Work," Prepared under contract with the United States Office of Education, San Francisco, vol. iv, Winter 1977, p.v.

5

"Annual Report. National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education," Washington, D.C. March 31, 1972, p.1.

6

"The World Development Program at Gustavus Adolphus College," Memorandum. St. Peter, Minn.: Gustavus Adolphus College, N.D.

7

Office of Consumers' Education. "Questions and Answers About the Consumers' Education Program," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. p.1.

8

Office of Consumers' Education. "A Look at 57 Projects in Consumers' Education." Summaries of Grants Awarded during 1977, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. pp. 23, 57.

9

"Project SCATE." a proposal submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, Environmental Education Office. Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1977.

10

"Assessing the Environmental Impacts of Energy-Related Development of Southwestern Utah," A proposal submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, Environmental Education Office. St. George, Utah: Five-County Association of Governments, 1976.

11

Ethnic Heritage Studies Branch, "Ethnic Heritage Studies Program. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IX, as amended. Guidelines for Application," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Post-Secondary Education. Division of International Education. September 1976, p.1.

12

Ibid, p. 16

13

Division of International Education, "Future Thrusts of International Education: Outreach and Citizenship Education." Excerpts from Congressional Legislation which revised and expanded Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. November 1976, p.2.

14

Ibid.

- 15 Don Davis, Miriam Clasby, and Marilyn Gittell,
"Citizen Participation in the School: A Special
Report to Policymakers in the States," Boston,
Mass.: Institute for Responsive Education, 1977,
p.8.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid, p. 9
- 18 Ibid.

APPENDIX

Newsletters on Funding Sources

For colleges and universities: Federal Research Report, P.O. Box 1067, Silver Spring, Md. Weekly \$48. Published by Business Publishers, Inc.

For school districts, and those interested in elementary and secondary education: Education Funding News, 752 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20045. Weekly. \$96. Published by Education Funding Research Council.

For local governments: Local Government Funding Report, 752 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20045. Weekly. \$96. Published by Government Information Services.

For nonprofit groups: The Grantsmanship Center News, 1015 West Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. 90015. Eight issues a year. \$15. Published by The Grantsmanship Center.

For public libraries: American Library Association Washington Newsletter, 110 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. At least 12 issues a year, irregularly published. \$10.

For museums: Adviso (a publication of the American Association of Museums), 1055 Thomas Jefferson St., Washington, D.C. 20007. \$24. Monthly.

General Guides to the Grants Process

Guide to Grants, by Milton K. Erway and Edward J. Murphy. This pamphlet is published by Southern Connecticut State College Foundation, Inc., P.O. Box 3144, New Haven, Conn. 06515. Cost: \$5. First edition published spring of 1977. New edition due out in October 1978. The guide gives detailed advice on how to develop a project

(thinking it through), identify sources of funding (public and private), write a proposal, do the project, and complete it. The references to sources of information will be most helpful to educators but the general advice will be helpful to anyone.

The Grantsmanship Center News is published by the Grantsmanship Center eight times a year. Designed to serve nonprofit groups, this excellent publication contains many general articles that will be of interest to anyone who is trying to learn about the Federal grants process or private foundations. Many of these general articles are available as reprints. The Center will send information about ordering these reprints upon request. A subscription to the magazine is \$15 a year. The Center also offers workshops on funding skills (\$245) in many cities. The Center's address is 1015 West Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. 90015

Publications of or about the Federal Government

Federal Register. Published daily on weekdays only, this publication is the official register for the U.S. Government. Regulations for many grants programs and announcements of their deadlines are published here. A year's subscription costs \$50. Send check for that amount to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Catalog of Domestic Assistance. This is the official (and only) catalog of grants published by the Federal Government. Published once a year, it tends to get out of date quickly. It provides a brief (if very general) description of each grants' program and information about where to go for further assistance. Costs: \$20. Order from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S.

Government Printing Office, Washington,
D.C. 20402.

Federal Fact Finder. A Key Word Telephone Directory of the Federal Government. Published by Washington Researchers, a professional information service. Cost: \$5.75. This 40-page booklet contains a directory of Federal agencies, departments, boards, and offices, organized alphabetically by key word. Also listed are the addresses of the 91 major Governmental units. For a copy of this booklet write: Washington Researchers, 910 Seventeenth St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978-260-934 2096